

ROUGH DRAFT

THE ST. ANDREW'S PROJECT

The Family Counseling Service of the Episcopal Community Services was deeply concerned regarding delinquency in the city of Philadelphia and how a Family Casework Agency could be of more help to these families. It was the agency's belief that an effort had to be made to reach out to the families who do not seek help on their own initiative.

In the fall of 1956, the agency began to explore what area of Philadelphia should be the spot to begin such a pilot project. It was decided after conferring with the director of the West District of the Health and Welfare Council that St. Andrew's - West Philadelphia was attempting to serve the entire community and it was felt that this was a good spot to locate the work.

St. Andrew's is located in the 16th Police District (Market north to Fairmount Park - 46th Street to the Schuylkill) which at that time (1956) was the third highest area in delinquency in Philadelphia. The Rev. Dr. Arnold Purdie, Director of Episcopal Community Services and Mrs. Alice T. Dashiell, Director of West District of the Health and Welfare Council approached the Rev. Edward P. Rementer as to whether he and the parish would be willing to be a part of this experimental project. To this, he agreed. A history of both the parish and Family Counseling Service of the Episcopal Community Services should be inserted here as a background before beginning to discuss the birth of this project.

BRIEF HISTORY OF ST. ANDREW'S - What is now the parish of St. Andrew's Church, West Philadelphia, was first organized the year 1819, under the name of St. Mark's Mantua. A church was erected at the corner at 36th and Sycamore Streets in this year and was consecrated by Bishop White on the 9th of August, 1821. Mantua, at that time, was a village to the West of the Schuylkill largely inhabited by summer residents, and Powell's Woods was a favorite resort for picnic parties in that day.

The population being very scant and embracing very few persons of means, caused the parish to have a struggling existence, and about the year 1830 the property was sold by the sheriff. The building remained unused for some years and was destroyed by fire in 1834. Services were now held in houses and halls for some years. At a meeting held on December 2, 1850, it was decided to reorganize the parish under the name of St. Andrew's, West Philadelphia. The church moved to 36th and Baring Streets in 1865. Before 1873, the surroundings of the church had been of semi-rural character, but now a change was begun. Increased facilities of transit and the general growth of the city in this direction gave an impetus to building and there came a great increase in population and church membership, in which St. Andrew's shared very largely.

By the close of the year 1879, all available space in the church, some 500 sittings, was fully occupied and the need for additional accommodations became imperative. So, after three years of steady canvassing, the building was begun (the present church) in October, 1883. In 1885 a surpliced choir was introduced and the church was opened on Easter Day of that same year. From 1885 through 1925, the

parish by all outward appearances seemed to flourish. It had served the immediate community with faithfulness and determination for over a hundred years.

With the death of The Rev. William Cox in 1932 a decided change became obvious. The shifting population, the encroachment of business caused the parishioners in many cases to leave the area. The parish strength had declined steadily through the years from a high of 750 in 1890, to 484 by 1917 to 209 in 1942. By 1955 the vestry felt it could no longer maintain the work at 36th and Baring. After a vote of approval by the congregation, the fate and future of the parish were turned over to the Bishop.

Upon close analysis of the situation, it was decided that a radical change had to be made if the parish was to remain and to serve the community. Ten of the eleven vestrymen lived outside the immediate parish area. The church was little more than a "week-end" affair. Attendance had fallen as low as 27 in a church which seats 550 to 600 comfortably. With the approval of Bishop Hart, it was agreed upon that if satisfactory to St. Andrew's and the Diocese, a full-time priest was to be in residence in the parish area.

By 1958 opportunities were so great and the parish's ability to meet them so limited that the parish appealed to the Diocese to help in its growing pains. The parish received a grant of \$9,000 from the Diocese which has aided it in concentrating on the re-building of the parish strength. The parish has made considerable strides - working in the community, living in the community, and certainly not depending upon the loyalties of those who have moved from the area. Even after years of hard work, St. Andrew's cannot claim in the eyes of the world

to be the epitome of success. But what we can say on the positive side, is that the church of St. Andrew's has changed radically from a parish which had ceased to serve the community to an aided integrated Episcopal Church, attempting by its Christian witness and concern to serve the entire community.

BRIEF HISTORY OF FAMILY COUNSELING SERVICE OF THE EPISCOPAL COMMUNITY SERVICES - The Episcopal Community Services, formerly the Philadelphia Protestant Episcopal City Mission,¹ also has an early history. The church was very much involved in the birth of this agency. The Bishop's Pastoral read at the Diocesan convention on May 1st, 1870, by the Rt. Rev. William Bacon Stevens, Bishop of Pennsylvania, makes this statement.

"The subject of City Missions is one of the gravest importance to us as citizens and Christians. The great mass of our criminals come from the uneducated and almost uncared for poor who are not reached or only partially so, by the existing religious agencies."

"The true way to uproot crime is to plant the seeds of pure and true religion, and this can be done taking the Gospel to the destitute and abased, that by its temporal and spiritual influences they may be lifted and reformed. If it is our duty as citizens to do this, for reason of municipal or wordly policy, much more as Christians, looking

1. The Philadelphia Protestant Episcopal City Mission was incorporated in 1877 and the last revision of its charter was November 17, 1958 when the name was changed to the Episcopal Community Services.

to the salvation of souls and the building up of the Redeemer's kingdom, should we make most vigorous efforts to give the heathen at our doors the blessings of the Gospel of Christ."

"To this end I have appointed the Rev. Samuel Durborrow, who for many years has been a faithful and zealous Rector of the Church of the Evangelists, at 9th and Christian, General Superintendent of the City Mission work in connection with the Protestant Episcopal Church and to cooperate with him I shall appoint several others, as our means permit, to act in different sections of the City."

For the first 47 years of its history, the Episcopal Community Services was "a center of relief work to the needy people, and a Chaplaincy Service to a wide variety of institutions, hospitals, prisons, and homes." "In the early days, it often supplied ministry to the new missionary work, a field now after many years served by the Diocesan Department of Missions."

Many changes have taken place over the years in the work of the Episcopal Community Services. Programs and efforts of work have been constantly modified in the light of new needs, new knowledge, and changing conditions. The earliest divisions of the Episcopal Community Services are the Chaplaincy Divisions and the Family Counseling Service. The other divisions are: All Saints Hospital, for the treatment of chronic disease; ² Episcopal Children's Service; James C. Smith Memorial Home, and Church Work Among the Blind. As the agency has grown there has also been changes in where the agency has made its headquarters. It was first located at 225 S. 9th Street and then to 411 Spruce Street

2. The foster home division of the Episcopal Community Services is now a part of a new agency: The Children's Center of the Episcopal Church.

and eventually to its present headquarters at 225 S. Third Street, Old Saint Paul's Church.

We are mainly concerned about the Family Counseling Service of the Episcopal Community Services. This division has gone through many, many changes, from first doing relief work to the present philosophy of offering Family casework help to the people in the community.

We would like to tell you about the purposes of Family Counseling Service. The purposes are "to strengthen and preserve family life; to render social casework service in accordance with approved standards to those seeking help with individual or family problems; to work toward the improvement of social conditions, and the eradication of evils affecting individuals and family life; to work cooperatively with other agencies and groups in a community that are concerned about life's social problems; to further the understanding the family casework counseling by members of the community, especially other churches; to express through ~~XXXX~~ the performance of these services are basic Christian beliefs and tradition. The provision of casework or counseling service to individuals and families without respect for race, creed, or color, is the main job of Family Counseling Service."

For 93 years the Episcopal Community Services has been concerned about the social problems of people in Philadelphia and it is both a community and church agency. It was so right that Family Counseling Service of the Episcopal Community Services and St. Andrew's Church, West Philadelphia, each having a long history of meeting the challenge of each era of change with a realistic reaching out to the community with spiritual help, and deep concern expressed by the offering of a

service to alleviate social problems. The joining of forces put a new creative dynamics in the implementation of help for these troubled people.

With the initial approach already behind us, the project was begun in January, 1957, with approval of the Vestry of St. Andrew's and with approval of the Board of Council of the Episcopal Community Services. The actual structure consisted of a caseworker on the staff of the Family Counseling Service of the Episcopal Community Services and the parish priest. It was agreed that Miss Goddard would be the caseworker assigned to the project of St. Andrew's. Both Miss Goddard and the Rev. E. P. Rementer agreed that in order for this project to be helpful, it was necessary for them to work as a team rather than each going his separate way.

Weekly conferences together were basic. Office space was provided at St. Andrew's for Miss Goddard. In the beginning, Miss Goddard spent at least a day or two in the area visiting people, as well as seeing Fr. Rementer at a specific time each week. At the present, it is a half a day a week. However, this does not include the time involved in interviewing clients at the agency's office. Fr. Rementer's part was to familiarize himself with all the services of the Episcopal Community Services. He also set aside time each week to see Miss Goddard. This was not always convenient, but necessary.

This might be a good point to pause and to share with you our concepts about each other's role in this project.

WORKING WITH A CLERGYMAN - I do feel it has been a most rewarding experience in being a caseworker on this Project. It has been a learning period for me, not just in the area of helping people, but in the area of working with a clergyman. One has often heard a clergyman remark

that social workers are not "Christian," and the clergyman's attitude is a negative one toward the social worker. I do feel it depends upon the attitude of the clergyman and the attitude of the social worker whether a working relationship can be developed.

Let us go back to January, 1957, -- the beginning of this Project. I remember very clearly my first meeting with Fr. Rementer. I could feel his reserve. I got a feeling that he accepted me with question. I knew that I had to give a great deal to this relationship. My attitude was that this was going to work, but there was a lot of hard work ahead for me. I knew that it wasn't going to be easy for me to interpret to Fr. Rementer the role of a caseworker.

In any profession, no one likes the other person taking over and telling them what to do; therefore I knew that I had to be careful in not trying to take over in any of the religious problems of the church. If this would have been done, it would have created more resistance in the beginning, and no relationship would have been established. I, therefore, was very careful to stay within the field of casework, -- leaving the religious problems to Fr. Rementer. A clergyman really has to be willing for a relationship to be established with the social worker. Fr. Rementer's willingness to work with the caseworker was the most important aspect of this Project. If this had not been his attitude, the Project would not have gotten off the ground.

It was only when we could accept each other as human beings in our own right that the ice was broken for both of us. We then could begin to accept each other in our professional role. We could talk together. Fr. Rementer would listen very patiently each week about my talking about casework. At times we differed, but we could accept the difference.

The meetings each week helped us to understand each other, and to get to know each other. It also helped us to establish a mutual trust and to accept and to respect each other's discipline. This was an involved process and did not happen over night. It was a sharing experience. Fr. Rementer could express his questions about casework, as well as my asking him questions about the church. In our mutual sharing with each other about our work, this is how the trust was established. When Fr. Rementer referred a parishioner of his, I always shared with him each step of the way in my working with the parishioner. I did not go into details all that transpired because this was confidential (between the person and the caseworker), but he knew the goals and the purposes of the help. In my contact with Fr. Rementer, I, too, began to have an understanding of the role of the clergyman and the demands made upon a clergyman. I also became keenly aware of all that is asked and required of a clergyman in such a parish as St. Andrew's, - - the frustrations, the slowness in the building of a congregation. It was a spot that I could identify with. I, too, could understand for it was hard to engage the people in a helping relationship. It meant going out many times to the person without success in reaching them. I, too, felt frustrated. It was very slow for the clients to really take help. This was a spot that we both could identify fairly well together. It was a language we understood. We had something in common in our work. My work was in offering people in this area help with their problems. This was slow to take on. Fr. Rementer was also offering religious help to the people in the area. The caseworker and the priest are both offering help in different areas of a person's life.

During a conference with Father Rementer and several social agencies, regarding a parishioner of his, it became very clear to me that as caseworkers we often say to the clergyman, "hands off." We do this so automatically without thinking what it does to the clergyman. We forget that a clergyman sees a parishioner many more times than a caseworker. We, as caseworkers, have to accept a clergyman's role in ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ with his parishioners and we have to learn to work with this.

There are many more things that I could say, but I have to tried to highlight the things that made a big impression upon me and what has taken place in this relationship. Both have to be willing for this to take place, if they are not, then nothing can come out of it. Both have to accept, to trust and to respect each other's roles and to be able to share a parishioner. It became very apparent to me that an agency such as ours can really offer a great deal of help to the clergyman in a city parish. I do feel that consultive service is very needed to our clergymen. There are so many complicated social problems confronting the clergyman, that one cannot do it all alone.

WORKING WITH SOCIAL WORKER - Working with a social worker, has been a rather unusual experience for me. Before I even considered the possibility of following the Project through, I, of course, spoke with other priests of our Diocese to see what they thought of the idea. Some thought that it might not be a good idea because it would affect my work as a priest. This, I discovered, didn't have to be the case. I was somewhat bolstered by the fact that the work being done in New York City at Trinity Parish, on the lower end of Manhattan, had quite a staff of social workers, psychiatrists, and the like, who were working in a team fashion and getting a great deal accomplished.

I think another factor that enabled me to let my guard down was that I discovered that Miss Goddard ^{and I} went to the same school. That gave me the assurance that she would be very Christian, or she should be quite Christian in her approach and this is something that most clergymen fear about social workers. After we went through the pangs of getting to know each other, and by the same token to trust each other, the work began to move along at a rather slow pace. I say slow because as a clergymen I soon was to discover that many of these people who need help, aren't always themselves conscious of that fact that they need help and that until they become aware of this and are willing to help themselves, you can't do much with them. A very tedious part of what I can see a social worker's job is, is to see that the client, or the individual being worked with, is made aware that she or he has a need to be helped; and then after they become aware of this fact, to seek the help and to grow themselves as human beings and be less dependent on society and more independent. This was rather slow in coming about. At the end of the first year I wasn't at all happy. I felt that Miss Goddard and myself were talking too much and getting too little done. By the end of the second year, I was not quite as adamant in my thinking on this matter, because I was beginning slowly to see some results. Ever so slowly I could point to individuals who had been helped, and I could see them in the parish, in the community, and they most certainly were different people, and they were thankful for the help they had received from the Episcopal Community Services as well as from the parish.

By the time the third year rolled around, we did compile some facts and figures; and it is surprising how many of the little cases that were helped can slip out of your mind until you have them recalled by concrete fact and figure.

As our mutual trust developed and became quite complete, I think that the greater the trust we had in each other, the more complete our helping the client would be possible. Not until I really felt I could tell Miss Goddard everything about a parishioner, do I think we were really able to help the person completely. Withholding information because of its private nature is sometimes a very great deterrent in aiding the person, whether it is the social worker involved or the parish priest.

One example which allowed me to trust the whole Project was when Dr. Purdie came out to speak to the Powelton neighbors in our community to explain this service and how it worked to the neighbors at an evening meeting. This was handled very nicely. I was very proud of our church and what it was trying to do in the city. Of course what they were trying to do and what sinful human beings were allowing to be done is something altogether different I am afraid.

I think one point needs to be made about the role of a clergyman and the role of a social worker. I don't think that every problem is a religious problem in society, and that there are lots of these problems in which a social worker, especially one with a Christian orientation, can be most helpful to a parish problem by their counsel and advice. One thing that I found extremely difficult to accept was the fact that Miss Goddard would insist that clients contact her, or that she would write a letter asking if she could come out to visit them. I always felt it was rather formal and almost to the point of being stilted, but the point being well taken by the social worker that is a person wants the help, they will respond to the letter and if they don't want

he

the help, they will not respond to the letter. As the old saying goes, "you can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink." People may want help but not want to pay the price of the help.

I don't think it is too revealing to say that working with a social worker in a parish situation like St. Andrew's has been quite helpful to me as a parish priest. Goodness only knows that we as clergymen have had lots of training, but we are not perfect in our training and there are lots of areas, in which we lack experience and in which we have to learn as quickly as we can to adjust to the current scene. I think one of the great reasons our church is ineffective in modern society is because we clergymen tend to get up on a cloud and stay up there, and that this pedestal, or cloud, as we may like to call it ourselves, is a nice isolating thing that we can stay on as long as someone meets our salary. However, that doesn't seem to do much good for the people we are supposed to be ministering to. I'm certain that the experience with the Episcopal Community Services' social worker has enriched my knowledge of human nature by plenty of discussions with her week after week. It enabled me to ask her questions, to argue with her, to present my point of view, to hear hers, to jostle with both points of view, and either to accept hers or not accept them, and in her case to accept mine or not accept them. One of the very important things in all of this is that I respect her opinion, even though I don't always agree with her, and the same thing I think with Miss Goddard. She respects my opinion even though she may not always accept it. This must also be, I think, a rather basic requisite to want to deal with people, that no two persons are alike, and that somewhere within that framework they have to adjust

to society which is rather of confusing.

The description of the neighborhood as it now exists will enable you to understand the complex nature of the community.

The boundaries of St. Andrew's Parish are the Schuylkill to the East, Market Street to the South, 39th Street to the West, and the Zoo on the North. The area is exceedingly complex in its institutions and geography. There are two great institutions of higher learning, located along its periphery - - Drexel Institute of Technology and the University of Pennsylvania. Both have students and faculty living in our community. There are two hospitals at least in our community, the Presbyterian, at 39th and Powelton and the American Oncologic Hospital, at 33rd and Powelton Avenue. Many people still living in this community, walk to work to these institutions.

According to a survey, prepared by John Halko, for the Philadelphia Council of Churches, in October of '53, "This community was originally composed of upper middle-class people. Its residents were successful merchants, businessmen, managers, administrators, professional men and women. Even today, a walk along Baring Street and Powelton Avenue, offers a picture of the former community to the close observer. There are only four or five, large, square three story mansard roof mansions occupying an entire block. Ironstone fences are abounding. Hitching posts are still there. Formal shrubbery and bushes reflect the glory of by-gone days. Now these former mansions have been converted into business and doctor's offices, dormitories, fraternities, boarding houses, or even Convalescent Homes. The casual stroller can see an apparent owner, sitting on the stone step in the mid-morning in the Spring, with a mop or dust-brush in her hand, with a dust-cap on her head, chatting

with a neighbor or resting between moments of her chores. This once proud owner now has converted her house into a boarding house, or to a rooming house, making the best of it." Of course change is always with us, but it seems that the major shift occurred in this community during World War II.

The parish itself, by its records, by its confirmations and baptisms, would indicate that the area had been declining since 1930 (since the depression.) But World War II seems to be the one point of time at which the greatest and the most obvious change took place. As one person stated in this community, and I've quote her, "These people came from everywhere and they were not our kind of people." "They stayed a little and moved on. There was nothing we could do for them as far as our church was concerned. After the war they returned." Naturally, there was considerable bitterness and frustrations in the community against the invasion of their area by these new-comers, these persons were inferior socially and economically. Many persons hesitated to travel the streets through fear of molestations in the evening. Even pastors left the parsonages to move to "greener pastures" in West Philadelphia or the suburbs. The decrease of land value made it a real estate area in which the values were considered very reasonable.

The constant flow in and out of persons attracted for a longer or shorter period by the institutions serving the neighborhood, including temporary visitors and employees, creates adjustment, and problems at the same time for both the churches as well as the civic institutions.

Up until 1957, this would be considered the low point of community esprit de corps, everything was going in a downward trend -- apathy

reigned, local residents' attitudes towards their community was practically non-existent, and this attitude, of course, was reflected in the church itself. Also, in the late 50's, we not only saw the development of the Powelton neighbors within the Powelton community, but we also saw on a larger view, the development of a West Philadelphia corporation, which extends from the Schuylkill to 45th Street, from Haverford Avenue down to the Media railroad tracks of the Pennsylvania Railroad. This rather large expansion of civic interest is chiefly for the rehabilitation of our community based on the two great institutions of higher learning and the Presbyterian Hospital and other large institutions with millions of dollars already invested in our community.

In the last 5 or 6 years there hasn't been anything short of a renaissance in the community. There has been a new public school put up across from the church itself for the people in Powelton. There have been all sorts of plans that are now being undertaken to beautify and to make the community that which good citizens would want to live in. One of the great points, in favor of Powelton, or of this parish area, is the accessibility to downtown. This is a factor that will always make this area in demand.

In all this change from the glories, so to speak, of the twenties, to the depression years of the thirties, to the pit of apathy of the fifties, to the comeback of the sixties, it is amazing how the church, if it is at all on its feet, reflects and mirrors all this change. Perhaps it is too superficial to say that the church that does reflect this will be respected. The church, however, that leads in making progressive changes will be the leader in the community because there is always necessary that very famous trilogy for a healthy community -- the church -- the home -- and the school.

The parish, always having been active in the community, desires to maintain this relationship. Fr. Rementer has been chairman of the 16th Police District Parent-Youth-Aid Committee for five years. Miss Goddard also became a member of this committee. This committee meets once a month at the parish office. Perhaps the function of this group should be stated at this point. The following statement is from the Constitution and By-Laws of the Youth Referral Program:

"The Youth Referral Program is a voluntary association of men and women sponsored jointly by the City of Philadelphia's Department of Public Welfare, Division of Youth Conservation Services, and the Police Department, Juvenile Aid Division.

a. Cooperating with the above sponsors are twenty-seven Parent Youth-Aid Committees in the various Police districts."

"Some of the objectives of the Youth Referral are: (1) "to identify and help youths between the ages of 7 and 17 having some contact with the police department." (2) "Through home visitations by mature adult volunteers, to promote a fuller realization of the Parents' primary responsibility for the proper supervision of their children."

With Miss Goddard being a member of this committee, the door was opened to her to get to know the community and the community to get to know her, and the agency she represented. It also enabled her to have an understanding of the problems in the community. In order for the parish to become familiar with Miss Goddard, she was present several times a year at the services of the Church. Each time, she was the parish's guest at an informal reception in order that the parishioners would get to know her so that this would make them less afraid in seeking

help. This broke the ice and was more effective than just having her name in the parish bulletin as our available social worker.

The referrals to Miss Goddard came from two sources - from the Parent-Youth-Aid Committee and from the Parish. Perhaps a description of the persons referred might be helpful to the understanding of this project. Individual adults and older people were most frequently referred by the parish. However, there were also families referred and naturally it was through the Parent-Youth-Aid Committee that most of the families with children were referred.

We would like to tell you about the Harris' since both of us in our respective roles worked together in helping them become a family. The following is a description of what transpired - -

Mrs. Harris, of her own accord, showed up at a church service. Mr. Harris was not with her. After a period of several weeks in getting acquainted, she expressed a desire to adopt a child. It was then that Fr. Rementer referred her to Miss Goddard.

Mrs. Harris was most prompt in following through Fr. Rementer's suggestion in coming to see Miss Goddard at St. Andrew's Parish House. The following is Miss Goddard's evaluation of what transpired in her first contact with Mrs. Harris.

Mrs. Harris was a most attractive woman. Her desire for a child was so great that she could not talk about anything else. Her terrific drive for a child was most unhealthy. She indicated that it was not her fault in not being able to have a child, - - it was her husband's. Mrs. Harris had gone to many child-placing agencies regarding adoption. They all rejected her because she and her husband were of a different denomination. Mrs. Harris had

rejected the Roman Catholic Church because of their saying "no" to her about adoption. Mr. Harris attended no church. The help this couple needed was first to come to grips regarding their church affiliation. At this point it was a problem for Fr. Rementer and not for Miss Goddard.

Father Rementer, and Miss Goddard talked this over together. We came to the understanding that Miss Goddard would not handle Mrs. Harris' problem of her religious background. It was also decided that Miss Goddard would go over what she had learned from the agencies (a very strong point in the eyes of an adoption agency is that the parents be of the same faith) with Mrs. Harris, - leaving with Mrs. Harris the decision of what she wanted to do. We did not want her to become an Episcopalian just to get a child. We wanted it to be a natural choice. Therefore it was left for Fr. Rementer to help them adjust to the life of the parish. It was understood that if at any time this couple needed to be referred back to Miss Goddard, that Fr. Rementer would suggest this to Mr. and Mrs. Harris.

Mrs. Harris began to be part of the parish life. She felt at home and accepted by the parishioners. In time, Mr. Harris came to church with her. Fr. Rementer made it a point to make several home visits to discuss the church and the need for it in their lives. Of course, this took time. When the confirmation class was announced, they were both in it. Mrs. Harris was received from the Roman Communion and Mr. Harris was confirmed by Bishop Armstrong. Fr. Rementer noticed as Mrs. Harris became more and more involved in

parish life, that the adoption of a child was not as paramount in her life.

The next time the subject was brought up by Mrs. Harris, Fr. Rementer referred both Mr. and Mrs. Harris back to Miss Goddard. This couple were now ready for this referral. Mr. and Mrs. Harris were wanting now to consider a foster child rather than an adopted child. Mrs. Harris was able to admit that she is the one who is unable to conceive. Mr. and Mrs. Harris were now ready to be referred to a child-placing agency. Since they were Episcopalians, they were referred to the Episcopal Children's Services. A foster child was placed in their home and remained there until the Harris' had to leave Philadelphia because of Mr. Harris' firm being transferred to the South. Since then, Fr. Rementer has heard from their rector in the South, and Miss Goddard, through Episcopal Children's Services, has recently heard that the Harris' have just adopted a child, and that this family is most active with the Episcopal Church where they live. The child has been baptized.

This is just one of the many examples of cooperation by both the priest and the social worker, which brought satisfactory results to both the client and the parish.

Miss Goddard would like to tell you about the Clark family, one of the families who was referred to her by the Parent-Youth-Aid Committee.

The Clark family was referred to us July, 1957, because of involvement with the police. Ruth, age 13, was picked up by the police on 1-23-57, -- the charge was "Investigation of Persons." This was a non-arrest. In my exploring exactly what happened with the police, it was learned that the police saw Ruth pick up a "March of Dimes" card. They saw her and another girl go to a house to solicit funds. This was the reason for the police being involved.

The Clark family had no contact with any other social agency until we came into the picture. We were active with this family from July, 1957 through May, 1961. Thirty two visits were made to this home. The family never came to the office. It has meant that I had to reach out to them.

Ruth came from a very large family (twelve children). There were nine children in the home. There were three married children, -- two daughters and a son. One of the married daughters was separated from her husband, and she was living with the family. This was a primitive family and they were culturally and educationally deprived. The parents were unable to read or to write. There was a mother and father in this home and they were married. Mr. Clark was a construction worker which meant, at times, there were periods of unemployment. During the periods of unemployment, the family received unemployment compensation, supplemented by relief.

During our contact, the family had moved five times, -- each move bettered their living conditions. Each move increased their desires and efforts in making their home more attractive and homey. None of the girls, as far as I know, have been illegitimately pregnant. All the children were somewhat slow in school due to their background. Mrs. Clark was a very large woman, -- weighing over 200 pounds and only 5'-3. She became very excited when talking with strangers; one could hardly understand her. Mr. Clark was a tall man. He was the dominant one in this family. This was the make-up of this family.

I would like to tell you very briefly about one of the visits I made to this home. It was one hot, summer day, in 1959, (temperature in the 90's I climbed three long flights of stairs. When I reached the top, you can imagine how hot it was. Here was this family, living in a tiny, three room apartment, with so many children. The apartment and the children

were clean and healthy looking. All the children were running around. The baby was in the crib. The television was blasting. There were roaches crawling up and down the wall. In spite of these conditions, we were able to talk together. I was not thrown by the roaches, etc. I was able to let myself sit down with this family and talk with them. The family then knew that I cared about them and accepted them. This was the reason that they could share and talk about their problems.

This family gradually let me know them. These parents had real feeling for their children and what was happening to them. In visiting this family on a regular basis, Mr. and Mrs. Clark began to trust me. I really became a part of the family. I knew all the children and they knew me. The help that these parents could grasp and take hold of was help around specific problems. Psychological insight into their basic problem was something that this family was unable to comprehend. However, they could understand and take help on such specific problems such as problems around school, their financial difficulties, and other problems relating to their roles as parents.

Both parents had a part in this helping relationship. Mr. Clark was not left out of the helping picture. However, there were times when he was not seen. Ruth and Jane and the other children were involved in help at different periods during the helping process. The help that Mr. and Mrs. Clark received enabled them to be better parents to their children. This was shown in what was happening to the children. Ruth began to adjust to school, no longer was she causing problems in the class-room. For example, she no longer wore seductive clothing. Jane, her younger sister, was showing the same acting out behavior. Mr. and Mrs. Clark were able to sit down and talk with Jane about this, as well as going to the school. These parents were quite hostile about going to the school. I felt that this was because the school was not patient in helping them understand

what was happening to the girls. It was also very hard for the school to understand Mrs. Clark's speech, especially when she became excited. Mr. and Mrs. Clark were able to get over this feeling, and they were able to work with the school.

The school worked closely with me around the Clark children. This enabled Ruth to sustain herself in school until she was 17 years of age. Jane was settling down in school. The next oldest son was doing well in school, and so were the other children.

This family had come a long way for them. Mr. and Mrs. Clark had real awareness of the help they had received from us. They knew, because of it, they were now more able to be better parents to their children. This family had a hard time to reach out for help. They never called me nor came to the office. By my going out to them, this enabled them to sustain themselves as a family, which was all that we could ask of them. They were closer to their children and had more understanding of them. The children, as far as I know, have been in no further difficulties. The parents were able to work with the school around the problems of their children. They still will have many difficult times ahead, but, hopefully, the help that they had received has given them the strength to reach out for help.

As a caseworker, it is only right for me to share the highlights of my learning in working with the parishioner in the parish as well as the families referred through the Parent-Youth-Aid Committee. Fr. Rementer knows how social workers like to talk, so here is my opportunity. I first would like to describe the learning that took place in my work with the parishioners. At the beginning of the Project, I was geared to having the clients come to the office. Home visits were of course made, but it was not the general practice. My attitude was that the clients who would not come to the office could not use help because of their lack of motiv-

ation. It was also my training a client should have a choice regarding help. I had to learn to be flexible in my casework approach to the parishioner of the parish. It did not mean just one method, but using several methods, either home visits or office visits or both. I learned, too, that choice was still there, but different.

Fr. Rementer would prepare the parishioner who needed the help. They would either call me, or I would reach out to them, -- depending on each individual's situation, -- there was no fixed rule. The positive relationship between the priest and his parishioners is very important. This enables the parishioner to trust what the priest is saying about help. The parishioner feels more positive about reaching out for help. There is fear there which is only natural. Because of this, on a whole, the parishioners have been able to reach out for help. This gives them the inner strength to do this, and the help is more sustaining. Fr. Rementer was there to support them through crucial periods of the helping process. I cannot say that all have been helped on a deep level, but I do feel that all of them have been helped in some way.

Our agency and Youth Conservation Services, who sponsored these committees throughout the city, came to the agreement before the Project started, that it was permissible for us to work with these families through the Parent-Youth-Aid Committee. In regard to the families referred by the Parent-Youth-Aid Committee, this was somewhat different. These clients did not know that they were being referred. It meant that I had to reach out to them. Again, I had to work through my own attitude about this. I had to change my attitude from a negative one to a positive one so that these families could be reached. It wasn't until my change in attitude could I be constructive in really helping these families. These families respond to feeling, and respond to the person liking them.

My impression is that these families are so economically deprived, so culturally deprived, and their problems are so insurmountable to them, that they are in a state of shock, -- unable to reach out for help. This feels to the community like apathy on the part of the family. Apathy is really their defense against letting the overwhelming anxiety of the problems touch them. On the whole, these families are glad that someone cares enough to come and help them. They are glad to be able to share their problems. They may never come to the office; they may never call, and they may never write, but this doesn't mean that help has not reached them. I know that when I first started this Project that I attempted to write a letter, leaving it up to them to call for an appointment, -- no results. I then tried writing a letter, giving them an office appointment, -- no results. I finally came to the method of writing to them, setting a definite date that I would be out to see them. This is the method that was finally used with most of the families. I do feel a letter should be sent to the family; this shows respect for them as human beings. It may create anxiety, but I think this is something that has to be risked. Home visit is the method to use. However, a caseworker should never lose sight that there will be a time when the client can take the step in coming to the office. The client always has a choice regarding help, but the caseworker limits this. For example, I would take the initiative in stating the date of my next home visit.

In the beginning, the specific or tangible problem was the referral from the police, stating that the child was in some difficulty. This was the tangible spot to begin with these families. Working with a specific, or tangible problem, were the tools that I used to build a relationship with these families, and this was the framework in reaching them with more crucial problems. A positive and stable relationship has to be established between client and caseworker before psychological insight into basic problems can

be used because it is too threatening to them. The client first sees the caseworker as a friend, and then as a part of the family as the helping relationship becomes meaningful to them.

I would say that most of the families have been reached in some way, but some of the families would not see me. Some of the families have been involved in help for over a period from two to three years. It takes time to establish a relationship with families so they can trust and take help. However, I have come to realize more than ever that it is easy to get caught in thinking that these people do not have the inner strength. This is not so; they do, and they can be reached. The casework method has to be flexible.

Family interview was the method used. When I went out to visit a family, I generally saw the mother, father, and many of the children. Sometimes we all sat down together to talk about their specific problem. Of course this did not happen in the very beginning, but gradually the family took real part in the interviews. Some social agencies were active with these families and some had no contact with agencies. It was important to contact the social agencies involved and this was done at various stages during the helping process. This included many telephone calls as well as several inter-agencies conferences.

It has been a rewarding experience for me to work with the people in the parish, and work with the families referred by the Parent-Youth-Aid Committee. I have real compassion for them and I like them. The number of families and individuals referred are 105.³ The number of home visits are 812.³ The number of office visits (agency office, or parish office) are 142.³

3. This is only a proportion of the total volume, some of the staff members of the Family Counseling Service also carried referrals from the Parent-Youth-Aid Committee and they are not counted in these figures (number of referrals, number of home visits and office visits.)

CONCLUSIONS

What is to be learned by all this experience?

1. That a team relationship of Priest - Social Worker is within the realm of possibility - depending of course on the attitudes of each person.
2. That each, through sharing their experiences, learned from the other in a fashion that enriched each person individually.
3. That two persons, sometimes working as a team and sometimes working individually, accomplish far more than one isolated priest or one isolated social worker.
4. That the continuity of weekly meeting is essential in this type work. At the beginning these meetings served a dual purpose: to enable each to understand and accept each other's discipline. Secondly, to discuss current problems and the further developments in any case under study.
5. That it is sometimes difficult for the clergyman to accept the fact that help is obtained through talking. Patience and having a "willing ear" are very necessary factors in helping people help themselves.
6. That through referrals, parish relationships were strengthened rather than weakened. Referrals with church connections seemed to have an inner strength to take and to use help more readily than those without this church connection.
7. That through the use of agency's services over the years, the parish has established a valuable working relationship which has resulted in using all of the divisions of the Episcopal Community Services. I,

as a caseworker, have found a deep appreciation and understanding of the priest and the parish as well as empathy for the complexities of the problems.

8. That the number of cases handled over a period of years isn't nearly as impressive to the observant as is a changed person who lives and moves in the community: a living example of help - both spiritual and casework.

Edward P. Rementer
and
Isabel Goddard

3-5-63